



1734

Daw

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In application of:

BARI W. BROWN

Group Art Unit: 1734

Serial No.: 10/085,370

Examiner: Michelle A. Lazor

Filed: February 28, 2002

For: METHOD OF MANUFACTURING A COMPOSITE PANEL

Attorney Docket No.: LEAR 0925 PUS

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a response to the Restriction Requirement of June 28, 2004. The Examiner has restricted the groups into two claims, Group I, claims 1-16 and Group II, claims 17 and 18. Applicant provisionally elects the Group 1 claims, claims 1-16 with traverse.

Furthermore, it appears that the Examiner has indicated that the application is believed to have two sets of patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- a. Natural fibers are provided as rovings; and
- b. Natural fibers are provided as a mat;

as well as

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8**

I hereby certify that this paper, including all enclosures referred to herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail, postage pre-paid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

July 14, 2004  
Date of Deposit

Michael S. Brodbine  
Name of Person Signing

- c. The natural fibers in isocyanate and resin mixture are applied to the skin simultaneously;
- d. The natural fibers are applied to the skin first and the isocyanate and resin mixture are applied onto the natural fibers.

Applicant provisionally elects with traverse to prosecute species b. and d. in which claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 14 and 16 are readable thereon.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the restriction and the election of species requirements. The Office indicates that Group I and Group II are distinct because the product can be made by another and materially different process. The Office's rejection requirement does not appear to be necessary. The Office's demand for a restriction requirement is burdensome, not only to the Patent Office and the applicant, but also to the public. Applicant will be forced to expend considerable monies for filing and prosecuting at least one additional patent application. The Office will be burdened by multiple unnecessary applications and redundant repetition of work. The public will generally be burdened by having to consider multiple applications and patents where in reality, the need for them does not exist.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn, and early action on the merits with respect to all the claims be issued.

Applicant believes that all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed. Prompt and favorable consideration of this application is requested. If the Examiner notes any minor errors, he is invited to telephone the undersigned so that the matter can be promptly handled by Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

**BARI W. BROWN**

By: 

Michael S. Brodbine

Reg. No. 38,302

Attorney for Applicant

Date: July 14, 2004

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: (248) 358-4400  
Fax: (248) 358-3351